Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/612,241	LOVETTE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tho v. Duong	3753
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	O personnel):	
(1) Tho v. Duong.	(3)	
(2) Thomas B. Haverstock.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 March 2006.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representativ	e]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊡ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: all the claims.		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g) was not reached. h) ⊠	N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the generated, or any other comments: <u>The examiner suggested</u> generating device coupled to a bottom surface of the interpolicant could not response the examiner's suggestion is issued.	ed to incorporate the claimed so rface layer, which defines over	ubject matter of a heat the prior art. However,
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amer allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach	copy of the amendments that	
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS IN FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INT requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	ne last Office action has alread R OF ONE MONTH OR THIRT ITERVIEW SUMMARY FORM,	y been filed, APPLICANT IS Y DAYS FROM THIS WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
•		
	Ahra. a	nuc
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sig	nature, if required